

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2005, the Examiner rejected all of the pending claims 1-15. Claims 4, 5, and 7 have been amended to delete the parentheses, as required by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

Claims 7-8 and 10, indicated by the Examiner as being allowable, have been amended to independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim. Thus, these claims are in condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102, ANTICIPATION BY SAKAI

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-5, 9 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakai. According to Sakai, it discloses information for managing and distributing design and manufacturing information throughout a factory to facilitate production of components such as bent sheet metal. According to Sakai, a sheet metal part design may be developed by the design office of a manufacturing facility using a Computer-Aided Design (CAD) system. See Sakai, column 1, lines 56-59.

According to the present invention as defined by independent claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12 and 13, it is directed to a method for editing configurations, for example. According to the method, a basic configuration can be specified that is invisible in a final three-dimensional configuration in a three-dimensional CAD system. The three-dimensional CAD system can be used to create a three-dimensional configuration by sequentially combining the basic configurations. See Specification of the Present Invention, Page 3, lines 3-6. In at least one embodiment of the invention, after allowing a configuration to be grasped, an attribute of the basic configuration can be deleted and/or reproduced.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified independent claims of the present invention are not anticipated by Sakai, as Sakai does not teach each and every element of the claims. For example, Sakai does not teach, "setting as an edit target the basic configuration finally combined with respect to the selected-in-the-making configuration" (as in claim 1). In contrast to the present invention, in Sakai, after selecting the particular part-shaped icons, an operator may edit a bend *sequence* by placing the particular piece in a desired location of the sequence of a plurality of parts. The part itself is not set as an edit target. Only the *sequence*, that is, the order of arrangement of the parts can be edited. See Sakai, column 71, lines 8-12

(clearly stating that “an operator may edit a selected bend *sequence*.” [emphasis added]).

Therefore claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are patentable over Sakai for the reason offered above. As claims 11, 12 and 13 recite similar language, they are also patentable over the reference for the reason offered above. As claims 9 and 14-15 depend from independent claims 2 and 13, respectively, these claims are also patentable over Sakai for at least the reasons offered above with respect to the independent claims, in addition to other reasons. For example, dependent claim 9 recites, in relevant part, “changing the edit target configuration.” In Sakai, no information is provided regarding changing an edit target configuration.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103, AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER SAKAI IN VIEW OF SHIMIZU

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai in view of Shimizu. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 6 are patentable over Sakai in view of Shimizu, as the references do not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 2, from which dependent claims 3 and 6 depend. Sakai does not teach or suggest, “setting as an edit target the basic configuration finally combined with respect to the selected-in-the-making configuration.” Please see argument above with respect to Sakai.

Likewise, Shimizu does not teach or suggest the feature of the claim identified by the above-quoted language. Shimizu is directed to generating a three-dimensional geometric model. In particular, according to Shimizu, dependency relation expressions are generated from geometric constraints between a plurality of geometric elements. According to Shimizu, it is concerned with detecting conflict and calculating dependency orders of a geometric model. See Shimizu, column 6, lines 5-11. See *a/so* Shimizu, FIG. 2. No information is provided or suggested in Shimizu regarding the above-identified feature. Therefore, neither Sakai nor Shimizu, taken alone, or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of claims 3 and 6 incorporated via claim 2.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Serial No. 09/639,763

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 25 APR 05

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas

Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501